The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <u>not</u> written for publication and is <u>not</u> binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DIMITRIS NAKOS, BALA KUMARESAN, JOHN JOHN E. SO, NILOY BANERJEE, LALITHA GANTI, RAMKUMAR VENKATARAMAN and THIVAKARAM PRAKASH SIVAKUMAR

MAILED

MAY 3 1 2005

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES Appeal No. 2005-1210 Application No. 09/945,438

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, KRASS, and RUGGIERO, <u>Administrative Patent Judges</u>.

THOMAS, <u>Administrative Patent Judge</u>.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants have appealed to the Board from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1 through 9.

Independent claim 1 is reproduced below:

- 1. A method for managing a database system including one or more database servers, the method comprising the steps of:
- executing, at a console, an integrated management module configured to manage at least two of the following layers in the database system: a database application layer, a database server layer, an operating system layer, and a hardware layer; and
- interacting with a user interface provided by said integrated management module to change operational parameters of said at least two layers.

The following reference is relied on by the examiner:

Immon et al. (Immon) 6,240,416 May 29, 2001 (filed Sep. 11, 1998)

Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Immon.

Claims 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As evidence of obviousness, the examiner relies upon Immon alone.

Rather that repeat the positions of the appellants and the examiner, reference is made to the brief and reply brief for appellants' positions, and to the answer for the examiner's positions.

<u>OPINION</u>

Since we reverse the rejection of independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, we also

Appeal No. 2005-1210 Application No. 09/945,438

reverse the separate rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of dependent claim 5.

The focus of the examiner's anticipation analysis is upon figure 7 and its corresponding discussion in Immon. However, from our review of this reference in its entirety, we agree with appellants' observations in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 in the principal brief on appeal as well as the first complete paragraph at page 8 as reproduced here:

There is absolutely nothing in Figure 7 that suggests that workstation 702 is an integrated management module configured to manage at least two of the following layers in the database system: a database application layer, a database server layer, an operating system layer, and a hardware layer. Immon does not teach or suggest that workstation 702 manages source 701 by changing operational parameters of source 701. Instead, Immon discloses that workstation 702 loads metadata from source 701. Loading is not managing. Loading from a source does not change operational parameters of the source.

Furthermore, there is absolutely nothing in Figure 7 that suggests that source 701 comprises at least two of a database application layer, a database server layer, an operating system layer, and a hardware layer. The sources that may be included in source 701 are data per se. These sources are not database applications, database servers, operating systems, or hardware. (emphasis in original)

Pages 8 and 9 of the brief continue by making reference to certain portions of Immon urging that those portions also fail to

Application No. 09/945,438

teach the changeability of operational parameters as set forth at the end of claim 1 on appeal. We essentially agree with this analysis as well.

Although even the abstract of Immon makes clear that his system manages metadata in a distributed or network computing environment among a plurality of servers on a single server, this reference fails to teach the substance of the claimed integrated management module having the ability to manage at least two of four identified layers of a database system. It is believed that the claim as well as the disclosed invention is consistent with the well known OSI software layering approaches in the art. There appears to be no indication to us that Immon even addresses his distributed system from the perspective of prior art software layers, but only from the perspective of processing and managing metadata, which is created as a natural byproduct of data processing as set forth in the initial paragraphs of column 1 of Overall, it is clear to us that the artisan would not have been placed in possession of the subject matter of independent claim 1 based upon Immon's teachings and showings.

Application No. 09/945,438

In view of the foregoing, the decision of the examiner rejecting various claims on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

JAMES D. THOMAS

Administrative Patent Judge

ERROL A. KRASS

Administrative Patent Judge

BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS AND

INTERFERENCES

JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO

Administrative Patent Judge

JDT/vsh

Application No. 09/945,438

HICKMAN, PALERMO, TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE CA 95110